

**REMARKS:**

This amendment is in response to both the recent office letter (March 28, 2006) and the recent telephone interview conducted on April 25, 2006 where a restriction was indicated, and that an amendment would help put the application in condition for allowance. Also that the remaining claims after restriction should be more concise, and that a reworked abstract would help, for readability.

**REMARKS REGARDING RESTRICTION:**

Please note that sheet 11 /12 of this amendment includes proof of letter response to restriction requirement, within 30 days of office letter. Regarding material that applicant did not select, it would be helpful if your office could indicate, informally, as to what novelty was found there as this is helpful feedback for use in a divisional application.

**REMARKS REGARDING AMENDED SPECIFICATION:**

The title was changed to reflect the subject matter kept after restriction, that is; including methods for data transfer.

The abstract was written in a less technical form, and also to reflect more introduction to the data transfer methods invention.

**REMARKS REGARDING AMENDED CLAIMS:**

**ALTERNATE TO SAME INVENTION:**

Claim 10 provides an alternative embodiment of data transfer methods. Prior art cited in original application (01/11/2002), especially Libby et. al., partially but incompletely suggests fragments of data transfer schemes. Claim 10 could be considered to encompass a half portion of this invention discrete bus method (the preferred embodiment). This is because claim 10 data transfer methods are presented for data transfers restricted to only any logical ones bits in the data.

This is a very subtle point and has been cause of much argument between computer experts. The inventor / applicant states (in the original specification of 01/11/2002) that while a mechanical pivoting wheel flip-flop is binary, having two resting states, the moving particle data transfer structures are used in a single state manner. Inventor / Applicant states in the original specification that the data transfer of a zero state would not directly supply an activating particle to act to reset a pivoting wheel.

The traditional view is that a ball represents a logical one, while no ball is representative of a logical zero. Therefore the original specification provides for the zero state case in a simple manner that involves novel physical structure and time sequential action methods. A system controller, knowing that a data write will occur (on the data transfer interface to a receiver device) will send to the receiver a default reset to all bits. Next, a logical OR is done by arranging to transfer data from a sender through a bus to the receiver.

This is not a clocked data latch scheme, as in electronics, but rather claim 10 is a scheme to accomplish the same logical results, that is a reposition of pivoting wheels in a receiver of a data transfer. Furthermore, many commercial clients insist on the availability of a more traditional binary programmed system (for teaching). The inventor / applicant prefers the more novel discrete bus aspects of the invention (a system called CM-2), but still about 40 percent of the original specification covers novel binary programmable logic (a system called CM-1).

Ultimately, It is the opinion of the inventor / applicant that all data transfer methods presented are species of the same invention, that is improvements over prior art for moving particle actuated transfers of control and data in a mechanical computer.

#### **GENERIC TERMINOLOGY NEEDED FOR NEW CLAIMS:**

A few additional generic terms were needed to clarify new claims presented in this amendment. In claim 10 was added the term “ONES TRANSFER” for distinguishing over the prior art term “MECHANICAL BINARY”. Claim 5-9 has the additional term “EXTENDED” to the phrase “DISCRETE BUS” to indicate control lines (material covering bus control lines was present in original specification of 01/11/2002).

Other patents in the invention class 710 often use the generic terms of “PHYSICAL SENDING DEVICE” and “PHYSICAL RECEIVING DEVICE” and these were used in the new claims herein to help put the application in allowable condition.

Inventor agrees to amend the specification to include any or all of these terms, assuming the USPTO allows.



MAY 30 2006

Appn. Number 10/043,960 (Bastian) GAU 2100 Amnt. A contd. 12 of 12

#### RECEIPT OF MAILED RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION:

Please note, this sheet includes a photo copy 04/27/06 mailing receipt for response to office restriction requirement of 03/28/06.

CASTRO VALLEY POST OFFICE  
CASTRO VALLEY, California  
945469991  
0555110094-0097  
04/27/2006 (800)275-8777 09:56:07 AM

Sales Receipt			
Product Description	Sale Qty	Unit Price	Final Price
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313			\$0.39
First-Class			
0.40 oz.			
		=====	
	Issue PVI:		\$0.39
		=====	
Total:			\$0.39
Paid by:			
Cash			\$1.00
Change Due:			-\$0.61
Bill#:	1000303023625		
Clerk:	07		

— All sales final on stamps and postage. —  
Refunds for guaranteed services only.  
Thank you for your business.  
Customer Copy

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

This certifies the mailing of this amendment A on Thursday, May 25, 2006.

Richard H. Bastian

Richard H. Bastian

DATE:

May 25, 2006